JUN 25 1984

006022

Walker Wright Young
Associates Limited

Planning Consultants

Myra Schiff
Consultants Limited

June, 1984

Interim Report on Public Concerns and Issues

Phase 2, Stage 2C Selection of Preferred Site

Environmental Assessment of the Landfill Component of Halton's Solid Waste Management System

URBAN DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
RESEARCH UNIT FOR URBAN STUDIES
McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

1. ISSUES AND CONCERNS

This Interim Report describes the issues and concerns of residents in the areas surrounding the six candidate sites, and the method which will be used to carry out the social impact assessment.

1.1 Method

The information on residents' issues and concerns was obtained through a series of meetings with concerned residents in the vicinity of each of the six candidate sites.

Two methods were used to identify residents who would attend meetings with the consultants. Letters were sent to individuals who had sent a letter to the consultants commenting on the Draft State 2B Report Selection of Candidate Sites (February 1984). This letter acknowledged their comments and indicated that if they wished to attend one of the workshops to be held in their community, they should contact the consultants. The same letter was sent to all individuals who indicated on their questionnaire that they were not on the project mailing list (as of March 1) and wished to have their names added to the list.

The second method involved working with citizen's groups in the area of the candidate sites who were concerned about the landfill issue and might be expected to wish to meet with the consultants in small group workshops. In order to ensure that the consultants identified all the relevant groups, a letter was sent to the Planning Director and the Clerk in each of Burlington, Milton and Oakville, asking them to identify the relevant groups. These groups were then contacted and discussions were held with respect to their participation in the workshops.

URBAN DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
RESEARCH UNIT FOR URBAN STUDIES
McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

006022

The original intent was to hold two workshops in each community, with about 20 different participants in each workshop. However, residents of the candidate sites in Oakville expressed strong feelings that this would not allow sufficient numbers of people to participate in the exercise, and it was therefore decided to hold one workshop for people living off site and beyond the half-mile study area, and to also hold three special site meetings for people living on-site or in the study area for the Oakville candidate sites. The Regions mailing list was used to send letters to all tenants and owners of land in that area informing them of the special site meetings.

The final schedule of meetings is shown below:

Burlington	workshops on April 30 and May 2 7:00 p.m., Maplehurst Public School
Milton	workshops on May 7 and 8 7:00 p.m., Boyne Community Centre
Oakville	workshop on May 9 7:00 p.m., Trafalgar Memorial Hall
	special site meetings on May 14, 15 and 17 7:00 p.m., Welding Institute of Canada

The proposed format for the workshop involved an initial presentation by the consultants of the draft work program for the social impact assessment and public participation programs in Phase 2C (Selection of a Preferred Site) followed by a question period. At the conclusion of the question period, it was intended that the workshop participants would break into three groups, each headed by a member of the consulting team. In these groups, residents would indicate additional factors and site specific conditions which they felt should be taken into consideration in comparing the six candidate sites. At the end of the evening, the three small groups would reconvene as one group, and a representative of each group would present a report on the evening's work. It should

be noted, however, that this procedure was not followed in all cases. At the Milton workshops on May 8, the residents expressed a strong preference for working as one group throughout the evening, and the plan was revised to accommodate this preference.

At the Oakville workshop and at the three site meetings, the procedure was modified to allow for expanded time for questions and comments from the group as a whole; following this, the consultants were available to discuss individual concerns.

The major focus of the workshops and meetings was on the social impact of a possible landfill site -- that is, how the location of a landfill at each of the six candidate sites would affect both the community and its individual members. Nevertheless, it was recognized that in some respects, any issue which was of concern to the participants fell under the heading of social impact precisely because it was of concern to the residents. All such comments were therefore noted, and a subsequent review of the material by the consultants was carried out to determine into which of the six evaluation categories (Public Health and Safety; Natural Environment; Social Environment; Cultural Environment; Costs; Engineering and Operations) the comment would be most appropriately located.

Because the comments made by the participants varied in each of the three communities containing candidate sites, the report will present the input of residents in each of the communities separately. The integration of this material into the social impact assessment process will be described in the second section of this report, which describes the procedures to be used in carrying out the social impact assessment for the six candidate sites.

In reviewing the comments obtained from residents at the three sites it should be noted that in many cases the consultants have summarized lengthy comments into a briefer statement which conveys the essence of the statement but not all the detailed information.

As well, it should be noted that the consultants have included here some statements which require more detailed investigation during the Phase 2C work. Inclusion of these comments is intended to highlight these issues, but should not necessarily be viewed as unconditional acceptance of these comments.

1.2 Burlington

The West Burlington Ratepayers Association supplied the consultants with a list of individuals interested in attending a workshop, and the consultants contacted each of these people by phone to confirm their attendance. Approximately 30 people attended the two workshops, with roughly equal numbers present each evening.

Presented below are the comments and concerns expressed by the individuals attending the Burlington workshops, organized with respect to the six evaluation factors which the consultants will use to make the final site selection.

HALTON LANDFILL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COMMENTS FROM BURLINGTON WORKSHOPS

RE: EVALUATION FACTORS

CATEGORY A: PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

FACTOR	COMMENTS
Groundwater and Surface Water Impact	- Site underlain with porous sub-soil and fractured shale. - Site is one the side of a hill and traversed with streams. - A drop in elevation from the Escarpment to Burlington Bay - The site situated above a populated area. - The site is 2 kilometers from major water mass, Lake Ontario. - Approximately 10 underground streams run through Aldershot; some already have a foul smell. - There are springs north of the railway -- one rises in the basement of the Royal Bank on Plains Road. - Drinking water from the Bay may be affected; the water intake is near Sioux Lookout. - There are some well water uses in Aldershot - A well on Kingswood Place was identified as polluted 20 years ago. - There already are polluted streams. - Plumes south of Highway 403. Two ponds there (one formerly called Gallagher's Pond) are polluted. - Sand south of North Service Road and sandy loam west of King Road.

- Existing sewage treatment system will not be able to handle dump runoff.

- Hydrogeological testing in the area is poorly monitored.

- Conflicting and inadequate information on hydrogeological tests in area.

- Leachate analysis by Province shows PCBs and heavy metals in Gallagher's Pond. A report from the Ministry of Environment is expected.

- As creeks go along, not only water but soil may become contaminated. This residual effect may be a health hazard for people and animals.

- There is already significant existing contamination in the area from past sites -- why subject the area to more?

- Impossible to police what gets dumped in a landfill site. What assurances can there be that no industrial waste, especially from Niagara Chemicals, and no septic waste gets dumped at site? If landfill operation is privately owned there will be even less responsibility to the public in this regard.

Traffic Safety Impact

- Select haulage routes where least impact, especially on children.

- There is a school bus route along North Service Road to Maplehurst Public School and Aldershot High School from Tyendaqa Area.

- King Road South is very congested at railway tracks.

- North Service Road was not intended as a truck route.

- There should be a right turning lane on North Service Road. Trucks present a hazard at this location now.

- It is dangerous to have large numbers of slow moving trucks coming off the QEW.

Vermin

- rats and mice

CATEGORY B: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Vegetation Communities, Wildlife, and Rare and Endangered Species (continued)	- Landfill spoils the natural environment.
	- There are Environmentally Sensitive Areas that abut site. Trees and birds in these Areas may be threatened.
	- Loss of natural wooded area.
	- Deer, rabbits, wolf may be affected.
	- Rare flora and fauna species of the area were noted in the Dillon Report.
	- Already some impact on wildlife and vegetation near existing landfill.
	- Indian Creek is dying. Leachate is killing trees and plants along bed of the Indian Creek.
Renewable and Mineral Resources	- Shale resource may be marketable in future.

CATEGORY C: SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Compatibility With Existing and Future Land Use	- Potential for residential development on the east side of King Road.
	- The area is good for recreational use: walks, etc.
	- Hidden Valley Park would be downstream of landfill -- north of Plains Road, 1/2 mile of Waterdown Road on Howard Road.
	- Bayview Park (the after-use of the existing dump) will be lost at time of filling the site because of noise levels.
	- Area south of Highway 403 west of King Road planned commercial and industrial.
Community Services and Facilities	- Landfill would displace the Burlington Rifle and Revolver Club and the Riding Ring.
Population Impact	- There can be no compensation for emotional impact.
	- Aldershot would bear the stigma of being the "dump" of Halton. Locating a third landfill in this area would definitely increase this stigma.
	- Aldershot is a high density population area.
Noise	- Truck traffic and equipment operated at site would both create noise.
	- Noise is problem from existing site now, and would be much worse at new site.
	- Bulldozers at existing dump can be heard outside from south of Plains Road.
	- Noise was noticed when existing dump first opened, now working face has moved north noise seems to be less noticeable. However, this may just be acclimatization like living near heavy traffic.

- Trucks on residential streets create noise. Haulers go to variety store near Cedarwood and Plains Road for coffee and leave engines running.

Airborne Contaminants

- Air quality is already poor due to existing landfill operation.
- Prevailing winds from west bring particulate matter, bacteria, smells into residential areas, creating allergies and respiratory problems.
- There is dust on houses in Aldershot from present landfill operation.
- There is pollution from both trucks and equipment on site.
- There is methane gas from the present dump.
- If the Energy From Wast Plant is located at the south corner of King Road and Highway 403 social problems would be compounded.

Population Impact

- Aldershot has small town identity which will be disrupted.
- It is a mature, treed, settled community. The area south of Plains Road in the Dovercourt/ Joan Drive area is 40 years old, the west side 25 years old, and the Waterdown Road area 75 years old.
- A landfill site in the area leads to random dumping in the general vicinity and reduces the tone of the area.

Social Equity

- The area has been used for dumping for the past 40 years. Trucks presently come to the Burlington site.
- Past experience with landfill sites has shown problems. People have had enough. It's someone else's turn.

CATEGORY D: CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

Significant Heritage Features	- Woodhill Farm, now belonging to Bob Ellstone, original farm of Sir A. Ferguson.
	- LaSalle Park which has a stream flowing from the north into the park.
Significant Archeological Sites	- Indian Creek and Indian Point.
Visual Impact	- View of the Escarpment would be obstructed from various viewpoints including the apartments and City Hall. Escarpment aesthetic appeal will be affected.
	- King Road is a gorgeous drive up to a pretty area of nice homes.
	- The landfill operation would be very noticeable along Highway 403 and from Holy Rosary Church, and also from areas above site and from apartments below.
	- Haulage trucks and litter
	- What is criteria for greenbelt anyway?

CATEGORY E: COSTS

Loss of Tax Revenue	- Prevention of future residential development in that area which would produce taxes, whereas no taxes from landfill site.
	- Displacement of CUMIS, and Tridon Industries.
Impact on Property Values	- All properties in area (especially north of Plains Road) will be devalued.
	- Could cut values 25% within 1/2 mile.
Haulage Costs	- Roads (especially King Road) would have to upgraded.
Capital and Operating Costs	- There would be clean up costs on site prior to development of new site.
	- If landfill operation is privately owned, there would be no control of costs by public.

CATEGORY F: ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS

Leachate Treatment	- Buffer too limited: dust, leachate impact all the way to the Lake.
	- Engineering on present sites very poor. Question the ability to provide containment, and to treat leachate and toxic chemicals at new facility.
	- Consider lagoons for leachate treatment.
After Use	- May be difficult to implement because of the changed environment.

1.3 Milton

About 45 people attended the two workshops held in Milton. Names of people to participate in the workshops were obtained from the Tremaine - Britannia Citizens Group, as well as individuals who had received the mailing, some of whom supplied names of other individuals when they were called to confirm their attendance.

COMMENTS FROM MILTON WORKSHOPS

RE: EVALUATION FACTORS

CATEGORY A: PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

	COMMENTS
Groundwater and Surface Water Impact	- Aquifers in area run from north-west to south-east. Landfill excavation will intercept utilized aquifers for water supply to wells.
	- Pressure on area water brings it up 60 feet because of artesian wells or streams on both sites.
	- The area has a high and variable water table.
	- There is substantial Spring runoff and substantial groundwater south-east of sites.
	- Landfill will cause pollution of wells. Some wells in area are only 9 feet deep. Every well south of sites will be polluted. Homes in area are dependent on wells.
	- Landfill drainage into Indian Creek will effect drinking water for livestock. Ponds in area are also used to water farm animals.
	- How do we identify and monitor contamination? If contamination occurs, what are the remedies?
	- We need a guarantee of alternate water sources for farm use and drinking.
	- Once site is completed, Region will forget about it and not provide the necessary perpetual care.
	- Bell School Line has been closed by the Region because of flooding.
Traffic Safety Impact	- More traffic means more road accidents.
	- Because of the narrow roads in the area, there would be a tremendous increase in traffic.
	- Trucks leaving clay soil at landfill site carry it onto paved highways and it is slick.

- Haulage trucks will interfere with farm vehicles.

- Slow moving trucks will disrupt normal traffic.

- Trucks will endanger school buses and threaten children's safety.

- High probability of accidents at railway crossings. There are crossings on Derry Road, Tremaine Road and Britannia Road.

- There would be a conflict between construction dump trucks and garbage trucks.

- Trucks will interfere with ambulance traffic to the Milton District Hospital.

- Landfill operation will bring heavy traffic through town and subdivisions.

- How do we restrict haulers to designated routes?

- In addition to garbage trucks there will be trucks bringing in fill to cover garbage.

Vermin

- Landfill site will bring gulls into area. Seagull droppings are a problem based on experience of living near Mississauga dump.

- Rats and other vermin will thrive on landfill site.

- Landfill may attract stray dogs.

CATEGORY B: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

Agricultural Resources	- Loss of prime agricultural land.
	- It is doubtful that the end use of the landfill site could be agricultural.
	- Dust from the landfill operation will affect crops and vegetation, including apple orchard of 50 acres adjacent to site, strawberries on Escarpment, elderberries, and bee pastures.
	- Dairy farms in area need pure water for livestock watering and for washing.
Vegetation Communities, Wildlife and Rare and Endangered Species	- There would be disruption of habitats on and off sites. There are good wildlife habitats along creeks and pond.
	- There are wetland areas near sites.
	- Landfill may eliminate some species and generate new species.
	- Some existing species which will be affected are: deer (in woodlot near Appleby Line and Derry Road), birds (including blue heron, crane, pileated woodpecker which are protected species), ducks, geese, otters wolves, fox, skunks, groundhogs, and muskrat.
	- Time is needed to conduct ecological studies of habitats in area. Samples taken from one woodlot would not be representative of entire area because some woodlots are deciduous, others coniferous, and others mixed, and therefore ecologically different.

CATEGORY C: SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Compatibility With Existing and Future Land Use

- Landfill operation would attract more industry to Milton which is incompatible with the current rural land use.
- Landfill operation would interfere with recreational uses of area: Tremaine Road and First Line now used for recreation activities -- bicycling, jogging, etc.
- Seagulls attracted to dump would be a hazard at airport in area. This airport is Halton's only licensed airport and has expanded since OMB hearings. Sites D and E are in landing pattern of airport.
- Changing roads to accomodate trucks will change the nature of the area, which presently has no large trucks.

Community Services and Facilities

- Landfill would detract from recreational facilities in area: Ontario Agricultural Museum, Kelso, Rattlesnake Point, Crawford Lake.
- Disruption to the Boyne Community Centre.
- Effect on horse farm and riders.
- Milton District Hospital in the area. Medical personnel will not be attracted to working near a dump. $15 Million expansion for third floor (with walkout) is planned.

Population Impact

- Residents in area under stress due to fighting the Region on waste disposal for 9 years. Residents feel beleaguered and want a long-term reprieve.
- 9 years indecision of landfill site has impeded people from making improvements and investments on lands.
- Residents are suffering stress due to distrust of the process, because of poor planning, lack of information to public.

- Stress due to fear of dislocation and lowering of lifestyle -- no other place is as good as this.

- Stress due to fear of financial loss.

- Stress due to worry over future contamination of livestock and wells. No guarantees forthcoming re: future water quality. Stress due to worry about possible unknown contamination now.

- Stigma on area over potential landfill site now would be increased if Milton site is chosen, especially since a landfill site would be so visible in this area.

Noise

- There is no background noise in area of either sites to cover up landfill noise from construction phase or operation phase.

- High wind levels at this site would carry noise from site. High winds due to wind tunnel effect from Escarpment.

- Noise would be caused by road construction to upgrade roads in this area and then later by the truck traffic.

Airborne Contaminants

- "Draft" effect from Escarpment, particularly on Site E would increase airborne contamination.

- Landfill site would create odour, blowing litter and dust in the area.

- Dust and molds from landfill site may create allergy problems.

- Methane gas would be produced at site.

Population Impact

- Landfill will cause disruption of a stable community.

- People have invested a lot of time, effort and commitment to the community.

- Near Site D there are about ten 5-generation families and there are also long established families near Site E.

- There is an established agricultural character to the area.

Social Equity

- Milton generates only a small proportion (10%) of Region's waste stream.

- Inequity of having no garbage pickup but having to take garbage for all the rest of the Region.

CATEGORY D: CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

Significant Heritage Features	- There are heritage homes along Highway 25 and First Line, (eg. Fond's) and at the northeast and southeast of Britannia Road. - Mr. & Mrs. Tomosky's house was the house of the first Sheriff of Halton County. - One-room schoolhouse -- the old Boyne school at Boyne Corners.
Significant Archeological Sites	- Indian artifacts exist on Site D, and also found in creek beds and Crawford Lake.
Visual Impact	- The visual impact at either site would exceed the 1/2 mile study area because the lands are flat and the landfill would stick up high. - Berming would be ineffective in concealing site from view from Escarpment. Rattlesnake Point overlooks both sites and view from it would be impaired by a landfill site below. Rattlesnake Point is the last lookout in Southern Ontario with such a wide vista (see Solandt report). - Site D is along Highway 25 which is an entrance way to Milton, and site would be visible from road despite berming. - Tremaine Road leading to recreation lands: Kelso and Ontario Agricultural Museum, Bell School Line leading to airport, First Line leading to hospital would all be similarly visually impaired as Highway 25. - Because of high wind levels on both sites, litter would not remain on site.

CATEGORY E: COSTS

Capital and Operating Costs	- Cost of piping leachate to treatment plant. Site should be close to sewage treatment plant to reduce costs.
	- Costs for water replacement means it would be better to put landfill site in area with water mains.
Impact on Property Values	- Property values will be depreciated by landfill site. There should be compensation for reduced property values.
	- Properties in the area will be difficult to sell.
	- Landfill site in the are will create problem for people whose income comes from renting land.
Loss of Livelihood	- Locating landfill site in centre of agricultural community will disrupt livelihood of farmers.
	- If Indian Creek is polluted, farmers may not be able to expand their livestock operations.
	- There would be a loss of livelihood along Britannia Road due to road widening.
	- W. Martin restores antique aircraft on his property.
	- Pick-your-own strawberry business on Escarpment would suffer because of dust from landfill and if water supply becomes polluted. Customers will not come to pick strawberries near a landfill site.
Compensation	- Compensation for losses if water is contaminated, including court costs, damages, etc.
	- Consider tax reduction as a means of compensation.
	- Consider industrial zoning as a form of compensation.

Haulage Costs

- The cost of upgrading roads in the area, especially as both sites are distant from main thoroughfares.
- Cost of a new bridge at Highway 25 and Sixteen Mile Creek.

CATEGORY F: ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS

Engineering and Operations	- OWMC criteria should also apply to Region's sites because site will contain toxic waste at least until OWMC opens own site.
	- Soils are poorly drained, and thus generate run-off. Need to engineer containment and collection of surface run-off on site.
	- Former Site F has been proven not feasible.
	- Night lighting would disturb neighbours.
Monitoring	- Concerned about after-hour illegal dumping.
	- Want assurances that there will be no trucking of hazardous wastes to landfill site.
	- Monitoring of wells in area -- who will do the testing? how often? and who will pay?
	- When candidate sites are drilled can hydrogeologists be present?
After Use	- Site will be there forever because the area is rural and therefore a landfill site won't be "absorbed" or return to normal.

1.4 Oakville

About 20 people who had contacted the consultant to express an interest in attending a workshop took part in the Oakville Workshop for people living off site and beyond the half-mile study area.

A second workshop is planned with a small group of Concerned Residents Over Waste (C.R.O.W.) members for mid-June. Results of this workshop will be recorded in minutes of the meeting. However, it should be noted that C.R.O.W. has submitted a brief outlining their major concerns on the Social and Cultural Environment, and these have been integrated with this report. The brief also contains detailed information on these two issues, and this information will be used in the site selection process.

In addition, about 120 people in total attended the three special site meetings held for people living on a candidate site or within the half-mile study area.

The comments and concerns expressed by Oakville residents at these four meetings with the consultants are summarized below.

COMMENTS FROM OAKVILLE WORKSHOP

AND SPECIAL SITE MEETINGS

CATEGORY A: PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

FACTOR	COMMENTS
Groundwater and Surface Water Impact	- Surface waters run fast and a lot on all three sites. - Because topography with entire area is very flat, the site is subject to seasonal flooding. - Substantial areas of ponding throughout area, especially during Spring. - Basic soil type is clay loam, but there are deep sand lenses underlying these soils. Leachate escaping into sand lenses would result in contamination of wells. - Contamination of wells in area is common, especially during spring. - Headwaters of Joshua Creek on east side of Site A. - Lake Ontario only 3 to 5 miles downstream. - Rock just 1 ft. below surface. - Only 12 ft. of topsoil on shale in this area. - Large underground river under Sites A and B according to Dillon report. - Contamination of wells would affect market garden businesses in area. - High water table. - Shallow wells: 20' overburden - Two creeks which run into the valley always run brown and have oil slicks due to Fourth Line Dump. - Creek at Sixth Line and Dundas empties into pond on Hays farm. Leachate in creek would kill trout in pond.

Traffic Safety Impact	- Truck traffic will dangerously conflict with major school bus routes.
	- Truck traffic will conflict with slow agricultural vehicles.
	- There would be heavy truck traffic through residential areas of North Oakville.
	- Litter blowing from site onto proposed extension of Highway 403 would create traffic hazard.
	- Haulage trucks will arrive in community about one a minute.
	- Entrance onto Burnhamthorpe Road would be impossible for haulage trucks.
	- Trucks will leave dirt on roads as they leave the site.
	- Trucks will slow traffic and create hazards and congestion of Trafalgar Road. Traffic congestion at Trafalgar and Highway 5 is already bad.
	- Trucks on Burnhamthorpe Road would interfere with horse trailer parking for the equestion shows. The Junior Equestion Event involves about 200 entrants for 1 week about 1/2 mile west of Trafalgar and Burnhamthorpe.
Vermin	- Will attract rats, seagulls.

CATEGORY B: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

FACTOR	COMMENTS
Vegetation Communities, Wildlife	- Beautiful Country
	- Wildflowers
	- Seagulls attracted to dump site may affect other birds. Oakville and especially Joshua Creek are on flightway of migratory birds.
	- Loss of woods, and various vegetation communities.
Agricultural Resource	- Site A is prime agricultural land with a soil class designation of #1 and is being farmed.
	- Oakville has smallest amount of agricultural land compared to the other Towns of Halton - why use up this agricultural resource?
	- Halton Region has more prime agricultural land than Quebec and the Maritime together -- don't use it for landfill operation.

CATEGORY C: SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

FACTOR	COMMENTS
Compatibility With Existing and Future Land Use	- Land should be left to more productive use. - Proposal conflicts with Provincial Agricultural guidelines to protect high quality farmlands and to ensure that major non-agricultural land uses do not take place on such lands. - A landfill site would destroy cohesiveness of farming operations in this area. Fabric of community will be disrupted. - The land has potential industrial land use (Peter Bernard Associates, 1983 Study Halton Rural Industrial Land Needs Study). - Conflict with approved development of uptown core. - Burnhamthorpe Road used by both area residents and whole North Oakville Community as a recreation facility: jogging, walking, bicycling, and drives out in the country. - Marsh and woods at end of Burnhamthorpe Road East also pleasant recreational spots. - Oakville expanding northward: Uptown Core proposed, River Oaks being developed - future residential land use. - Site A, B, C too close to urban area now. - Cemetery on Site C.

Community Services and Facilities	- Several social and school outings take place on properties in the area:
	  - School trips to Arnold Fish's dairy farm.
	  - Toastmaster's Club of Oakville picnic on Masterson's land.
	  - 4 Art Studios in area visited by people of Oakville.

- Events for Historial Society have been held in properties in the area.
- Great Danes of Canada annual meet at Masterson's.

- Oakville Model Flying Club on Trafalgar Road between Dundas and Burnhamthorpe.
- Munn's United Church is an active church and community centre.

Population Impact

- Emotional suffering since announcement of candidate sites.
- Emotional impact of landfill should be considered.
- Major long-term changes to the social fabric of Oakville are possible.
- Many people will have to be dislocated.
- Many people are living near sites and more will be with development of Uptown Core and River Oaks.
- Stigma: no one will want to live in Oakville in a few years' time because of dump.
- Disruption of children's education if need to move.
- Long established families in area: a seventh generation family farming with the area.
- This is a close knit community where people help each other out and watch out for the well-being of other members of the community.

Airborne Contaminants

- Site A experiences almost continuous strong westerly winds that will sweep across landfill site carrying waste onto Highway 403 and beyond.
- Wind will cary dirt, odour and litter.

Social Equity

- Composting own garbage for years, now asked to take other's garbage; don't even have garbage service.
- Lands in area already expropriated for Highway 403, pipeline, hydro line -- how much more land will have to be given up?
- OWMC may also select site near this area - more landfilling than one community should have to accept.
- Community has had dump on either side for years one now causing problems with Joshua Creek, the other with 16-Mile Creek.

CATEGORY D: CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

FACTOR	COMMENTS
Significant Heritage Features	- Masterson home built in 1848 and being restored to original.
	- Designated historic area.
	- Barns should be preserved as they are vanishing from the Canadian landscape.
	- Many homes in community are 85 years old, some even 120 years old.
	- Munn's United Church is a historic edifice considered sufficiently significant to have been moved back when Highway 5 was widened. Present building dates from 1898; there has been an established congregation since 1870. The old manse built in 1837 is on Trafalgar Road just north of the Texaco station.
Visual Impact	- Approved plans for Highway 403 include a major elevated interchange at both the north east and north west corners of Site A. Berming of landfill operation would not conceal it from view from these elevated interchanges.
	- Trafalgar Road is gateway to Oakville. Impression impaired by landfill site and garbage trucks.

CATEGORY E: COSTS

Impact on Property Values	- There will be a decrease in property values.
	- Real estate values in North Oakville have already been damaged by announcement of candidate sites.
	- Loss on house and barn improvements made on Site properties.
	- Compensation for decrease in property values. Don't want to lose investment.
	- Property values in area will remain depressed because of the heavy traffic of haulage trucks.
Loss of Livelihood	- Several artists and craftspeople in area who could not move easily - depend on local traffic, use barns on site, etc.
	- Masterson property used to breed Great Danes.
	- Welding Institute is a significant employer and would be displaced if Site A were chosen.
	- Area of small market gardening businesses.
Compensation	- Water mains from town to replace well water.
	- Should be compensation for residents beyond 1/2 mile as well as within it.
	- If fields damaged because wet when drill tests begin, should be compensation.
	- Compensation scheme should be established before announcement of selected site.
Loss of Tax Revenue	- According to Ministry of Revenue Assessment Office use of Site A for landfill rather than for industrial would result in about $10 million tax loss annually.
Haulage Costs	- Will need to haul fill to cover garbage.

CATEGORY F: ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS

FACTOR	COMMENTS
Site Size	- 250 acre requirement based on Halton operating an Energy From Waste (EFW) system. If no EFW, then landfill site will need to be much larger than 250 acres.
Site Servicing	- Can Oakville sewage treatment plant handle leachate collected on landfill site?
Monitoring	- Need controls on what is going into dump. If OWMC selects a Milton site for toxic waste plant, what assurances that Halton's landfill won't get residue from OWMC plant?

URBAN DOCUMENTATION CENTRE
RESEARCH UNIT FOR URBAN STUDIES
McMASTER UNIVERSITY
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

1.5 Summary

A review of the comments presented to the consultants at the Burlington, Milton and Oakville meetings reveals numerous similarities in the concerns expressed. Most notable among these is the strong concern for public health and safety (i.e. the effect of a landfill on ground and surface water and safety problems resulting from increased truck traffic.) This is consistent with the consultants' approach to the site selection process, in which the factor of public health and safety is of prime importance. Concern about noise, and about airborne contaminants such as dust, odour and litter is common to residents at all three sites, as are concerns about the visual impact of a landfill. In all three communities, residents described their community as a stable residential area and raised the issue of social equity. Residents in all three communities also expressed concern about the study process and about the political decision-making process which would take place after the consultants had submitted their recommendations to the Region.

There were, of course, also many differences between the comments obtained in the three communities. These differences reflect the different nature of the three communities and their varied histories with respect to landfill with their area. The task facing the consultants, therefore, is to determine a set of procedures which will allow for uniform comparison of the six candidate sites in as fair and objective a manner as possible. It is this issue which will be addressed with the next section, which describes the Social Impact Assessment Methodology.

2. SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

This section will describe the procedure the consultants will use in carrying out the social impact assessment. The approach used in developing the procedure will be described first, followed by a description of information sources and of the method to be used in assessing the social impact of a landfill.

2.1 Approach

Several considerations guided the design of the social impact methodology. These are set forth below.

To as great an extent as possible, the factors used in this stage of work should be the consistent with those used previously, since they have been circulated to and accepted by agencies and members of the public.

In line with this approach, only one additional factor "Social Equity" has been added as a major factor under the heading "Social Environment". There are now six factors under the heading "Social Environment":

- Compatibility with existing and future land use
- Community services and facilities
- Population impact
- Noise
- Airborne contaminants
- Social equity

Several measures additional to those described in Draft Evaluation Factors, Phase 2, Stage 2B: Selection of Candidate Sites have been added. This expansion of measures is in keeping with the more detailed evaluations required for the selection of a preferred site, and reflects material gained from the workshops and special site meetings.

Whenever possible, objective and quantifiable measures will be used to measure impacts, in order to permit the fairest and most objective comparison between sites.

Impacts which cannot be quantified will be assessed on a qualitative basis, using information provided as part of the public participation process.

2.2 Information Sources

Several different sources will be used to obtain the information necessary to carry out an equitable and comprehensive social impact assessment.

Questionnaires have been sent to all households living on a candidate site or in the half-mile study area. Questionnaires were also sent to individuals owning property on the site or in the study area, regardless of where they live.

The questionnaire was designed to provide a demographic and social profile of households and the way they use their land for recreational and revenue-generating purposes. As well, the questionnaire seeks information on social networks through questions on the number of friends and relatives living nearby and the frequency of contact with these individuals. A copy of the questionnaire and the cover letter may be found in Appendix A.

Technical information on the areas which will be affected by noise and airborne contaminants such as litter, dust and odour will be supplied by other members of the consulting team. The consultant will then use appropriate data sources to determine the number of households which will be affected by such impacts.

Meetings will be held with individuals responsible for community serving facilities and institutions to determine how the location of a landfill would affect their operations. Questions to be addressed include the kinds and amount of use of their facilities, the numbers of individuals and groups served, the uniqueness of the facility, and the compatibility of the facility's use with a landfill operation.

Information for carrying out qualitative assessments will be obtained through review of material presented to the consultants at the workshops and special site meetings, as well as in the form of briefs, letters, and comments forming part of questionnaire responses.

If information gaps are identified with the course of carrying out the assessment, information sources, will be sought as needed, in order to ensure that the assessment is as fair and comprehensive as possible.

2.3 Social Impact Measures

In this section the sub-factors for each of the six major social impact factors are described, as are the ways in which they will be measured.

2.3.1 Compatibility with Existing and Future Land Uses

The general approach to the land use planning component during Stage 2C will involve the degree of compatibility of a landfilling operation with land use at each of the six candidate sites, and the opportunities for land uses or concurrent uses at each of the six sites. The following issues will be addressed:

- Possible end uses or concurrent uses for candidate sites, based on local conditions and existing planning policies;

- detailed planning assessment of the use of the candidate site for landfill, including the nature and extent of requirements for Official Plan Amendment(s), zoning amendment(s) and/or site plan control, depending on plans of individual area municipalities, the Region, and Provincial policies and guidelines;

- On-site inspection of detailed land use.

This component of the social impact assessment will be carried out by Walker, Wright, Young Associates Limited.

2.3.2 Community Services and Facilities

This factor is intended to address the issue of how the location of a landfill at each of the six candidate sites would affect community services and facilities with the surrounding area.

Two sub-factors will be considered in undertaking this evaluation:

- Physical facilities and institutions in the vicinity of a candidate site;

- The extent to which land on or near a candidate site serves as a community resource for recreational, cultural and educational purposes.

In order to develop an appreciation of the impact of the landfill on physical facilities, interviews will be held with the individuals responsible for these facilities to obtain their views on how the location of a landfill would affect the quantity and quality of

services they provide. Among the issues to be addressed are the types of activities which occur in their facility; the frequency with which the facility is used; the numbers of individuals and groups served, and the feasibility of continued functioning of the facility if a landfill were to be located nearby.

The facilities whose operations will be assessed in this manner are:

- Trafalgar Memorial Hall
- Munn's United Church
- Boyne Community Centre
- Kelso Conservation Area
- Rattlesnake Point Conservation Area
- Ontario Agricultural Museum
- Burlington Rifle and Revolver Club Inc.
- Bayview Park
- Milton District Hospital

The effect of a landfill on the operations of the Welding Institute of Canada will be considered as part of the economic impact assessment. Cemeteries, the Coast Guard station in Oakville, and the airport in Milton and the Oakville Model Flying Club, will be evaluated as part of the land use analysis.

The evaluation of these facilities will of necessity be qualitative. In carrying out the assessment, special emphasis will be placed on those facilities which are not readily replaceable, either because of their historic nature or because the services they provide could not easily be provided elsewhere.

The extent to which land on or near a candidate site serves as a community resource for recreational, cultural and educational purposes will be assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively.

- The quantitative assessment will be based on responses to information obtained from the questionnaires on the manner in which residents use their property for recreational purposes

and the frequency of use for each purpose. A weighted index, in which the weights reflect the frequency of use, will be developed to allow for comparison of this sub-factor across sites.

- The qualitative assessment will reflect the extent to which land in the vicinity of the site is used by individuals from the larger community. These uses would include hiking, walking, driving, biking and jogging in the area because of its special appeal. It will also include special events such as horse and dog shows, picnics, for community groups, tours for school groups, and similar events of this nature.

2.3.3 Population Impact

Four major sub-factors fall under the factor of population impact:

- Disruption of an established community
- Dislocation of individuals and households
- Emotional impact
- Unique and special population groups

Several different measures will be used to assess each of these factors.

Disruption of an Established Community

The measures for assessing this sub-factor will address two major issues:

- The stability of the community.
- The social networks found among residents living in the vicinity of a candidate site.

Two measures will be used to assess the stability of the community:

- The length of time current residents or their extended family have lived on or near a candidate site;

- The length of time current residents or their families have owned property on or near a candidate site.

The data needed to develop these measures will be obtained from the questionnaire responses.

Measures of the social network of residents living in the vicinity of the candidate sites will also be developed from questionnaire responses. The two measures to be used here are:

- Number of relatives living within 3 miles of the respondent's current residence on or near a candidate site;
- The frequency with which members of the household see relatives, friends and neighbours living within 3 miles of their residence. A weighted index, in which the weights reflect the frequency of visits, will be developed to allow this measure to be compared across sites.

Disruption or Dislocations of Individuals and Households

This sub-factor is intended to reflect the number of individuals and households which would experience disruption of their lives as a result of the selection of a candidate site; as well, the number of individuals and households who would experience special problems because of their age or because they earn their livelihood from activities undertaken on or in the vicinity of a candidate site will also be assessed here.

General measures of disruption include:

- Number of households on a candidate site;
- Number of people living on a candidate site;
- Number of households in the study area;
- Number of individuals living in the study area.

Special measures of disruption include:

- The number of households on site in which part or all of their income is derived from activities undertaken on a candidate

site or in the study area. This information will be summarized through the development of a weighted index in which the weights reflect the proportion of household income generated by activities undertaken on the candidate site or in the study area.

- The number of households in the study area in which part or all of their income is derived from activities undertaken in the study area or on the candidate site. The same weighted index described above will be used here.

- The number of households on a candidate site in which all or part of the household's income is generated from activities undertaken on the site or in the study area and in which the wage-earner is over 45 years old. The same weighted index described previously will be used here. This measure is included to reflect the additional difficulty that older wage earners often experience in starting their operation anew or in finding alternate employment.

- The measure described above will also be developed for households in the study area.

- The number of people living on a candidate site who are over 65 years old. This measure is intended to reflect the fact that this group is at greater risk as a result of involuntary relocation.

- The number of children between 5 and 16 years of age living a candidate on site. This measure is included because of the disruption of children's education which would result if a household had to move because of the location of a landfill.

Emotional Impact

This qualitative sub-factor will assess the issues of:

- Stigma resulting from having a landfill in the community;
- Stress resulting from the selection process;
- Stress resulting from being unsure of the future and of whether or not to make expenditures to improve property.

Unique and Special Population Groups

This factor will measure the number of members of unique and special population groups which will be affected by a landfill.

- The number of people who earn their living as artists, artisans, craftspeople and writers living on a candidate site or in the half mile study area will be determined from questionnaire responses.
- The numbers of institutionalized members of special population groups on a candidate site, in the study area, or along local haulage routes will be assessed through the use of social service directories and, if necessary, interviews with directors of institutions containing such individuals.

2.3.4 Noise

The impact of a landfill site on the sound environment will be addressed from two aspects: (i) the noise impact of the road traffic generated by the site; and (ii) the noise impact of the equipment associated with the landfill operation.

In order to assess the potential noise effects at a candidate site, and along haul routes, the predicted future sound levels will be compared to the present conditions and to relevant noise standards and criteria. The information that is necessary for this assess-

ment will be acquired through field investigations and by integrating data from other team members. The specific information is listed below.

(i) Road Traffic Generated Noise

For haulage routes to the site, from a major artery:

- Traffic volume now and projected;
- Projected traffic volumes and types related to landfilling;
- Traffic flow speed;
- Road surfaces;
- Road grades, and off-road topography;
- location and type of buildings along roads.

(ii) On-Site Generated Noise

- Existing sound environment, determined from existing land use;
- Survey of existing noise sources;
- Location and number of nearby residences or other sensitive land uses (distance, direction);
- Existing potential acoustical barriers on and around site, e.g., topography, vegetation, intervening structures, etc.;
- Types of activities related to landfilling.

From this information, predictions of changes in sound exposure along the haulage routes and around the site will be calculated, using a production model for a general landfill site of the magnitude projected for Halton. No sound level measurements will be obtained.

The evaluation of the potential noise effects will take into consideration mitigating measures which, if implemented, would reduce adverse impacts. Such measures as the following will be investigated:

- berms and/or acoustic barriers around candidate sites
- designating truck haulage routes and placing truck traffic bans on other roads

The number of households that will be affected by unacceptable noise levels, using established government standards, will be determined for each site and will serve as the measure for this variable. All households which fall within the area of unacceptable noise levels will be included in the count, regardless of whether they are within or beyond the boundaries of the half-mile study area.

2.3.5 Airborne Contaminants

Airborne contaminants include dust, litter and odour resulting from the operation of a landfill.

Since, at any landfill sites the potential for generating each of these components is relatively the same, the investigation will concentrate on ascertaining existing conditions, and on the characteristics that influence dispersion from a site.

Information on the physical area that will be affected by airborne contaminants will be generated by members of the consulting team with special expertise in developing such information. The social impact will be measured by the number of households at each site which are contained within the impact area.

It should be noted that all households within the area affected by airborne contaminants will be included in the measure, whether they are within or beyond the boundaries of the half-mile study area.

2.3.6 Social Equity

This factor has been added to the list of factors used in previous stages of the environmental assessment process undertaken on this project. It is meant to address the issue of the fairness of the burden of a landfill being located in each of the three communities, an issue that was raised by residents in the vicinity of all six candidate sites.

Evaluation of this factor will be based on:

- History of the area with respect to Regional landfill site(s) and stress associated with this history;
- History of the area with respect to municipal landfill site(s) and stress associated with this history;
- Whether or not the area is serviced by garbage collection;
- The proportion of the Region's waste stream generated by the municipality in which the site is located.

While the last two components can be objectively measured, clearly the first two cannot. Consequently, the measure for this factor will be undertaken on a qualitative basis.

2.4 Evaluation

In keeping with procedures used throughout the environmental assessment process to date, each of the six social impact factors will carry equal weight in the evaluation process.

However, impacts will not be assigned ratings (e.g. severe, high, medium, and low) since there are no absolute criteria which can be used for this purpose. Furthermore, even where there are a small number of people in a given category, each of these individuals

would feel the impact to be severe. Therefore, to reflect the relative nature of social impacts, each candidate site will be ranked (i.e., one through six) for each social factor, and these rankings will be used in the site selection process.

3. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The preparation of this report is meant to serve several functions.

As an Interim Report to Halton Regional Council, it is intended to provide members of Council with an up-to-date and more detailed appreciation of the concerns of Halton residents with respect to the selection of a preferred site for a landfill.

The report forms the basis for the second round of workshops with members of the public, at which the preliminary social impact forecasts will be reviewed and mitigation measures discussed. Following receipt of this report by the Region's Solid Waste Management Committee it will be mailed to everyone on the Landfill Environmental Assessment mailing list.

At these workshops the preliminary social impact assessment, as described in Section 2 of this report, will be presented for review. Following the identification of specific mitigation measures, the preliminary assessment will be revised to reflect these measures; these revised measures will be used in the selection of a preferred site.

This report documents a wide range of concerns on the part of residents attending the workshops and site meetings. While all of these may, in some sense, be considered social impacts in that all of of them affect, directly or indirectly, the residents in the area of the site. Many of them, however, are of a technical nature and are better addressed by people with special expertise in these matters. Copies of this report will therefore be circulated to all members of the consulting team to ensure they are aware of all the issues and information contained in this report.

APPENDIX A

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

QUESTIONNAIRE

HALTON LANDFILL

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

For most of the questions, you can indicate a response by circling or checking your answer, or by filling in a blank. Where your own words are required, you may continue your answer on the back of the page if there is not enough space on the front.

The first set of questions are intended to provide us with a profile of your household and the way you use your property on or near the candidate site.

1. Do you live (CHECK ONE)

_____ in a residence <u>on</u> a candidate site (GO TO Q.2)

_____ in a residence <u>near</u> a candidate site (GO TO Q.3)

_____ neither -- ie, your primary residence is neither on or near a candidate site (GO TO Q.7)

2. IF YOU LIVE <u>ON</u> A CANDIDATE SITE, check the site you live on

_____ Site A (northeast quadrant of Burnhamthorpe and Trafalgar)

_____ Site B (southwest quadrant of Burnhamthorpe and Trafalgar)

_____ Site C (southeast quadrant of Burnhamthorpe and Trafalgar)

_____ Site D (southeast quadrant of Britannia and First Line)

_____ Site E (northwest quadrant of Tremaine and Britannia)

_____ Site F (northwest corner of King Road and North Service Road)

3a. IF YOU LIVE <u>NEAR</u> BUT <u>NOT</u> <u>ON</u> A CANDIDATE SITE, check the site <u>nearest</u> your home.

_____ more than one site (GO TO Q.3b)

OR

_____ Site A (northeast quadrant of Burnhamthorpe and Trafalgar)

_____ Site B (southwest quadrant of Burnhamthorpe and Trafalgar)

_____ Site C (southeast quadrant of Burnhamthorpe and Trafalgar)

_____ Site D (southeast quadrant of Britannia and First Line)

_____ Site E (northwest quadrant of Tremaine and Britannia)

_____ Site F (northwest corner of King Road and North Service Road)

3b. IF MORE THAN ONE SITE IS NEAREST YOUR HOME, please draw a sketch diagram on the back of this page showing tne location of your house in relation to the nearest candidate sites.

4a. How many people live in your household? _____

4b. How many people in your household fall into each of the age categories listed below?

_____ less than 5 years old
_____ 5 to 10 years old
_____ 11 to 16 years old
_____ 17 to 21 years old
_____ 22 to 35 years old
_____ 36 to 45 years old
_____ 46 to 55 years old
_____ 56 to 65 years old
_____ 66 to 75 years old
_____ over 75 years old

4c. Of these, how many are <u>not</u> members of your family, such as boarders, tenants or people employed by the household?

_____

5. How long have you and members of your or your spouse's extended family (eg, parents, grandparents, etc.) lived at or near a candidate site?

_____ years

6a. How many of your relatives live:

within ½ mile of your house _____
between ½ mile and 1 mile of your house _____
between 1 mile and 1½ miles of your house _____
between 1½ and 2 miles of your house _____
between 2 and 3 miles of your house _____

6b. Of your relatives, friends and neighbours who live within 3 miles of your house, how many do you see

almost every day _____
two to four times a week _____
about once a week _____

7. How long have members of your or your spouse's family owned property on or near a candidate site?

_____ years

8a. Listed below are some ways in which you or members of your household may use your property on or near a candidate site for recreational purposes. For each activity, please specify how often you use your property for this purpose by circling the appropriate word.

OFTEN = ONCE A WEEK OR MORE
SOMETIMES = AT LEAST ONCE A MONTH
RARELY = LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH
NEVER = NOT AT ALL

ACTIVITY	FREQUENCY (Circle One Answer for Each Activity)			
1. Picnics	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
2. Barbecues	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
3. Gardening	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
4. Cross-country skiing	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
5. Swimming	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
6. Horseback riding	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
7. Walks or Hikes	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
8. Bird Watching	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Other (please specify)				
9. _____	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
10.	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

8b. Please list below any other leisure and recreational activities of the members of your household. Include group, family-oriented and solitary activities. For each activity, please indicate approximately how often the activity occurs, and where it takes place.

Use the categories below to describe how often the activity occurs. Put the number which matches the appropriate category in the box marked "HOW OFTEN".

1 = EVERY DAY OR ALMOST EVERY DAY
2 = TWO TO FOUR TIMES A WEEK
3 = ABOUT ONCE A WEEK
4 = ABOUT TWICE A MONTH
5 = ABOUT ONCE A MONTH
6 = LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH

	ACTIVITY	HOW OFTEN (Use numbers from list above)	WHERE
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

9a. The set of questions below are concerned with the use to which you put the property or properties you own or rent on a candidate site or in a study area. Please answer the questions in this section with respect to <u>each</u> parcel of land on a site or in the study area, by circling the appropriate answer.

PARCEL	IS IT ON OR NEAR (Circle one word for each parcel)		SITE IT IS ON OR NEAREST (Circle one letter only for each parcel)
Parcel 1	ON	NEAR	A B C D E F
Parcel 2	ON	NEAR	A B C D E F
Parcel 3	ON	NEAR	A B C D E F
Parcel 4	ON	NEAR	A B C D E F
Parcel 5	ON	NEAR	A B C D E F

9b. For each parcel, please indicate the proportion of your household's income that is derived from activities you undertake on the parcel, by circling the appropriate category. PLEASE ANSWER USING THE SAME ORDER OF PARCELS YOU USED IN Q.8a.

PARCEL	PROPORTION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME (Circle one answer for each parcel					
Parcel 1	0-10%	11-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
Parcel 2	0-10%	11-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
Parcel 3	0-10%	11-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
Parcel 4	0-10%	11-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%
Parcel 5	0-10%	11-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-89%	90-100%

9c. The last question in this series has to do with how you use your parcels of land. In the table below,

(1) indicate the main use for each parcel you rent or own by putting the appropriate number from the list below in the column headed MAIN USE.

(2) indicate any other use or uses for each parcel by putting the appropriate number from the list below in the column headed OTHER USES.

(3) list any major buildings other than your house and garage, such as a barn, studio, silo, workshop, etc. which are located on each parcel.

PLEASE LIST THE PARCELS IN THE SAME ORDER YOU USED IN Q.8a.

USES

1 = residential
2 = raising dairy cattle
3 = raising beef cattle
4 = raising swine
5 = raising poultry
6 = raising horses
7 = raising vegetable or fruit crop
8 = raising cash crops
9 = artists studio, workshop, office, etc.
10 = commercial recreation (e.g., riding stable, swimming, cross-country skiing)
11 = land held for investment purposes
12 = other (please specify)

PARCEL	MAIN USE (Use Numbers from list above)	OTHER USES (Use numbers from list above)	MAJOR BUILDINGS
Parcel 1			
Parcel 2			
Parcel 3			
Parcel 4			
Parcel 5			

10a. How many acres of land do you own on a candidate site or in the study area?

_____ acres

10b. Of these, how many acres do you rent to someone else?

_____ acres

11a. Please describe how you think the location of a landfill on or near your property or properties would affect your income. PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE. Use the back of this page and additional sheets if necessary.

11b. Please describe how you think the location of a landfill on or near your property or properties would affect your life-style or quality of life. PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE. Use the back of this page and additional sheets if necessary.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.